

REMARKS

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention as disclosed in the written description. In particular, the claims have been amended for clarity.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-16 (Claim 17 having previously been cancelled) under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0191955 to Koike et al.

The Koike et al. publication discloses a data recording and reproducing apparatus, which includes a video interface circuit for receiving and digitizing analog video signals and a digital interface circuit for receiving digital video signals, the apparatus further including a VTR portion for recording digital video signals onto video tape, and an MO disc portion for recording digital video signal onto magneto-optical discs.

As noted in MPEP §2131, it is well-founded that "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Further, "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claim 1 (as well as claims 15 and 16) includes the limitations "a detector for detecting a presence of a second input signal on the second input", "means for causing the video recording apparatus to operate in a first operating mode when said detector does not detect a second input signal on the second input" and "means for causing the video recording apparatus to operate in a second operating mode having different functionality than the first operating mode when said detector detects a second input signal on the second input".

While, as noted by the Examiner, Koike et al. discloses two modes of operation, i.e., when an analog video signal is applied (via video I/F 24) and when a digital video signal is applied (via digital I/F 44), Applicants submit that there is no disclosure or suggestion in Koike et al. of the detector as claimed in claim 1. Applicants further submit that there is no disclosure or suggestion of the means for the causing the video recording apparatus to operate in a first operating mode when no second signal is detected, nor of the means for causing the video recording apparatus to operate in a second operating mode when a second signal is detected.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that the subject invention, as claimed, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the prior art, and as such, is patentable thereover.

Applicant believes that this application, containing claims 1-16, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by /Edward W. Goodman/
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613
Attorney
Tel.: 914-333-9611